

And let's not forget, for male employees of these firms, their wives and daughters who are on their healthcare coverage will also be discriminated against and treated differently.

The stupidity of this Supreme Court decision is that it completely overlooks the fact that 58 percent of the women who get prescription oral contraceptives do it not just for birth control, but for another medical reason, such as endometriosis, ovarian cysts, or Polycystic Ovary Syndrome. Even those women will be out of luck, which means they don't have the same rights as all those men who buy Viagra. That's still covered.

The most dangerous thing that has happened here is that this court has set a precedent for the nearly 48 cases currently working their way through the courts filed by for-profit companies about contraception coverage. Those 48 cases now have this decision as legal precedent.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the idea of blood transfusions, vaccinations, and treatment for HIV/AIDS would no longer be covered. With this court, we are pedaling backward to the 19th century but I've got news for the five men on the court behind this decision: the women of America don't want to go! And this bill helps ensure that we don't.

H.R. 5051, The Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act—also called the "Not My Boss's Business Act"—would ensure that an employer that provides a group health plan for its employees does not deny coverage of a specific health care item or service to its employees or covered dependents of employees where that coverage is mandated by Federal law.

The bill specifically states the Religious Freedom Restoration Act does not excuse or relieve this duty, and allows for the existing exemption for houses of worship and accommodation for religious non-profit organizations that do not wish to provide coverage of contraceptives.

The women of this country don't want a court or anyone else to determine that they are second-class citizens, and this bill would put an end to that. And what we need is a vote. We're all here today to call on Speaker BOEHNER to bring this to the floor. Wouldn't that be something?

Mr. Speaker, the House has been given two opportunities to defeat the previous question: once on Tuesday, and another today. Both times, we offered an amendment to the rule that would have given Members an opportunity to consider reversing the damage done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision. Both times, the House has rejected this measure.

No employer should have the right to limit the health choices of its employees—male or female. It is pure discrimination, when 99 percent of women in this country have used some form of birth control during their lifetime—but now have to literally go to unreasonable measures to simply secure the fundamental health care they need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 2014, I was unavoidably detained from votes due to a

conflict. Had I been present on the House floor I would have voted as follows: "no" on rollcall No. 408, H. Res. 669, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

I would have voted as follows on amendments to H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015: "aye" on rollcall No. 409, the Jackson Lee Amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 410, the Roskam Amendment; "aye" on rollcall No. 411, the Moore Amendment; and "aye" on rollcall No. 412, the Waters Amendment.

RECOGNIZING MS. DOROTHY
PARKS FOR HER 50 YEARS OF
DEDICATED AND FAITHFUL
SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dorothy Parks. I had the honor and privilege of working with Ms. Parks in Plattsburgh, NY for more than 30 years. She works hard every day, diligently and happily performing the tasks she is assigned.

This month will mark her 50th year at the firm where we both worked, she having started there on July 13, 1964. During her five decades at the firm, Ms. Parks earned the respect of all who came to trust and depend on her, including myself. She has guided many new staff and young lawyers, teaching us the ropes, if you will, with a smile and a gentle hand.

While working for the firm, Ms. Parks raised four children and now has six loving grandchildren for whom she is a dedicated grandparent.

Ms. Parks' employer, Stafford, Piller, Murnane, Kelleher and Trombley, will be recognizing her successful 50 year career later this month with a celebratory luncheon.

H.R. 5016, "FINANCIAL SERVICES
AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AP-
PROPRIATIONS ACT"

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act.

The bill cut too deeply into many important services—including an insane \$340 million cut to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). No business cripples its account receivables department and neither should we. The Congressional Budget Office has found that cutting the IRS's ability to enforce tax law ultimately costs more in lost revenue than the money saved in the initial cut. This is simply bad policy that does not save the government money.

I was pleased to see the rejection of an amendment offered by Representative FLEMING, which would have rolled back the Administration's guidance to banks seeking to provide services to state-legal marijuana busi-

nesses, and the adoption of an amendment offered by Representative HECK, which will increase access to these services. These were two strong votes to stop forcing state-legal marijuana businesses to operate only in cash, a situation that is unsafe and invites illegal activity. This was a victory for commonsense reform.

This was a rare bright spot, however, in otherwise reckless legislation that slows the enactment of effective financial regulations, reduces our ability to collect much-needed revenue and meddles in the affairs of the D.C. government. It was for these reasons that I opposed this legislation and was disappointed to see it pass.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "PRO-
TECTING EMPLOYEES AND RE-
TIREEES IN MUNICIPAL BANK-
RUPTCIES ACT OF 2014"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 17, 2014

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, when a municipality files for bankruptcy, its employees and retirees who have devoted their lives to public service—such as police officers, firefighters, sanitation workers and office personnel—risk having their hard-earned wages, pensions and health benefits cut or even eliminated.

This is why I am introducing the "Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2014." This legislation strengthens protections for employees and retirees under chapter 9 municipality bankruptcy cases by: (1) clarifying the criteria that a municipality must meet before it can obtain chapter 9 bankruptcy relief; (2) ensuring that the interests of employees and retirees are represented in the chapter 9 case; and (3) imposing heightened standards that a municipality must meet before it may modify any collective bargaining agreement or retiree benefit.

While many municipalities often work to limit the impact of budget cuts on their employees and retirees, as was recently demonstrated in the chapter 9 plan of adjustment recently approved by Detroit's public employees and retirees, other municipalities could try to use current bankruptcy law to set aside collective bargaining agreements and retiree protections.

My legislation addresses this risk by requiring the municipality to engage in meaningful good faith negotiations with their employees and retirees before the municipality can apply for chapter 9 bankruptcy relief. This measure would also expedite the appellate review process of whether a municipality has complied with this and other requirements. And, the bill ensures employees and retirees have a say in any plan that would modify their benefits.

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION

Sec. 1. Short Title. Section 1 of the bill sets forth the short title of the bill as the "Protecting Employees and Retirees in Municipal Bankruptcies Act of 2014."

Sec. 2. Determination of Municipality Eligibility To Be a Debtor Under Chapter 9 of Title II of the United States Code. A municipality can petition to be a debtor under chapter 9, a specialized form of bankruptcy relief, only if a bankruptcy court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the municipality satisfies certain criteria specified